

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were pending as of the action mailed on July 30, 2007.

Claims 15, 19, and 23 are being canceled. Claims 1, 5, 7, 9-13, 16-17, 20-22, and 24 are being amended. Claims 7 and 11 are being amended to correct typographical errors. The amendments to claims 1, 5, and 9 are supported, for example, by the language of the specification in the paragraphs beginning on line 5 of page 1, line 26 of page 2, line 4 of page 3, and line 5 of page 7. Claims 13, 17, and 21 are being amended to incorporate the features of the canceled claims 15, 19, and 23, respectively. The amendments to claims 13, 17, and 21 are supported, for example, by the language of the specification in the paragraphs beginning on line 5 of page 1 and line 16 of page 3. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102

Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, and 21 were rejected as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,839,686 ("Galant"). Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, and 21 are independent claims.

Claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites a computer program product operable to cause data processing apparatus to perform operations including "displaying, on a display device, a transaction screen containing data for a transaction," where "the transaction [is] a set of actions that either commits or aborts," and "user-provided data is required for the transaction." The operations further include "waiting to receive a user response providing data for the transaction in the transaction screen" and "automatically refreshing the transaction screen with updated data if user input to the transaction screen is not received within a pre-determined period of time."

The examiner rejected claim 1, applying Galant as follows:

As per claim 1, Galant teaches . . . displaying, on a display device, a transaction screen containing data for a transaction, waiting to receive user input to the transaction screen, and automatically refreshing the transaction screen with updated data if user input is not received within a pre-determined period of time (fig. 3; col. 7, lines 40 et seq.; *Auto Refresh Tab 143a being used to automatically refresh the transaction screen if user input is not received within a certain amount of as set by a timer*).

The applicant disagrees. Claim 1 recites displaying a transaction screen containing data for a transaction and waiting to receive a user response providing data for the transaction in the transaction screen. A transaction is a set of actions that either commits or aborts, and user-provided data is required for the transaction.

In contrast, the figure and passage of Galant cited by the examiner for disclosing a transaction screen do not teach a transaction screen containing data for a transaction for which user-provided data is required. Figure 3 of Galant illustrates a user interface for viewing a composite of financial information, including treasury benchmarks, exchange indices, and currency exchange rates. The user interface includes a number of labeled tabs (e.g., Markets, Debt, Equity), which can be selected to view information about the respective topics. *See* Figure 3 and Col. 7, lines 9-18. The user interface can also be used to view financial news over various time frames and stock quotes. *See* Figure 3 and Col. 7, lines 19-28. However, Figure 3 and the cited portion of Galant do not disclose a transaction screen containing data for a transaction, where user-provided data is required for the transaction. On the contrary, the user interface of Figure 3 accepts input to select the type of information to be viewed; it does not require and wait to receive a user response providing data for a particular transaction. Thus, the limitations of the claim are not met.

The examiner failed to find in Galant the recited transaction screen containing data for a transaction for which user-provided data is required. Because the examiner has failed to find all of the limitations of claim 1 in the cited art, the examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of anticipation, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependents are in condition for allowance.

Claims 5 and 9. The examiner rejected independent claims 5 and 9 on the same grounds as claim 1. Claims 5 and 9, as amended, include limitations similar to those of claim 1. The rejection of claim 1 has been addressed above.

For the reasons set forth above in reference to claim 1, the rejection of claims 5 and 9 should be withdrawn, and the claims should be allowed. The dependents of claims 5 and 9 are also in condition for allowance for the same reasons.

Claim 13. Claim 13, as amended, incorporates the features of claim 15 and recites “displaying on a display device of [a] client, a transaction screen received from [a] server,”

where “the transaction screen [contains] data for a transaction” and “automatically refreshing the transaction screen on the client with updated data by simulating user input requesting that the transaction screen be refreshed.”

The examiner stated that claim 15 was “allowable over the art of record because the art of record does not disclose the recited limitations.” Because claim 13, as amended, incorporates the features of claim 15, the rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn. Accordingly, claim 13 and its dependents are in condition for allowance.

Claims 17 and 21. The examiner rejected independent claims 17 and 21 on the same grounds as claim 13. Claims 17 and 21, as amended, include limitations similar to those of claim 13. The rejection of claim 13 has been addressed above.

For the reasons set forth above in reference to claim 13, the rejection of claims 17 and 21 should be withdrawn, and the claims should be allowed. The dependents of claims 17 and 21 are also in condition for allowance for the same reasons.

Section 103

Claims 2, 6, 10, 14, 18, and 22 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,839,686 (“Galant”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,089,508 (“Wright”).

Claim 2. Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Claim 2 recites “simulating user input requesting that the transaction screen be refreshed” and “refreshing the transaction screen with updated data in response to the simulated user input.” The examiner concedes that “Galant does not teach the use of simulating a user input to request for the screen to be refreshed.” For this feature, the examiner stated that “such a step is known in the art” and cites Wright as teaching “the use of simulating a user input to maintain the current display information (col. 5, lines 46-54; *a pseudo user input would be generated which inherently keep the screen refreshed with current display information*).”

The applicant disagrees. Wright teaches generating a pseudo user input to prevent activation of a screen saver. *See* Col. 5, lines 46-54. That is, the pseudo user input of Wright preserves whatever is presently displayed on the screen. The portion of Wright relied upon by the examiner does not disclose or suggest simulating user input requesting that a transaction

screen be refreshed and refreshing the transaction screen with updated data, as recited in claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 is in condition for allowance.

Moreover, as addressed above, Galant fails to teach or suggest a transaction screen containing data for a transaction for which user-provided data is required, as required by claim 1 upon which claim 2 depends. The relied upon portion of Wright fails to remedy this deficiency. The applicant submits that for this additional reason, claim 2 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 6, 10, 14, 18, and 22. The examiner rejected claims 6, 10, 14, 18, and 22 on the same grounds as claim 2. Claims 6, 10, 14, 18, and 22 include limitations similar to those of claim 2. For the reasons set forth above in reference to claim 2, the rejection of claims 6, 10, 14, 18, and 22 should be withdrawn, and the claims should be allowed.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : Miroslav Cina
Serial No. : 10/734,511
Filed : December 12, 2003
Page : 12 of 12

Attorney's Docket No.: 13913-119001 / 2003P00359
US

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 01 Oct 07

/Hans R. Troesch/

Hans R. Troesch
Reg. No. 36,950

Customer No. 32864

Fish & Richardson P.C.

Telephone: (650) 839-5070

Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50435053.doc